DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 287 CG 016 866

AUTHOR Falkenberg, Steven D.; And Others
TITLE Measuring Attitudes toward Males in Society.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (29th, Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983). Best copy available. Copies of the Attitudes Toward Males in Society Scale are available from the authors.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; College Students; Factor Analysis; *Factor Structure; Higher Education; *Males; Rating Scales; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Attitudes; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Attitudes Toward Men in Society Scale

ABSTRACT

Although there are over 100 different measures of various aspects of sex role activities, little work has been done to measure male sex role stereotypy or attitudes. Doyle and Moore (1978) factored five scales out of a large pool of items administered to several different groups. To clarify and broaden Doyle and Moore's work, and to develop a measure of attitudes toward males in society, 40 additional items were generated to add to Doyle and Moore's original 45 items, producing an 85-item pool. Factor analysis of college students' (61 males and 123 females) responses to the items (both the original Doyle and Moore items and then of all 85 items) yielded 23 possible factors, with half of the items, including 15 of the 40 new items, loading on a single factor. Fourteen items which loaded over .30 on this factor and did not load higher on any other factors (even in the Doyle and Moore study) were chosen to form the Attitudes Toward Males in Society Scale (AMS). AMS scores were completed for each participant and compared to demographic data. Analyses of results showed that females had a slightly more liberated view of male roles in society than males, and older women were more liberal than younger women. There was no difference with age among men. (MCF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED233287

Measuring Attitudes Toward Males in Society

Steven D. Falkenberg

C. Douglas Hindman

and

Donald Masey

Eastern Kentucky University

Presented to Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA, March 1983.

Running head: Attitudes toward males

CG 016866

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Douglas Hindman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

A pool of 85 items related to males roles in society was developed which included Doyle & Moore's 45-item pool. Alpha factor analysis of responses of 184 college students indicated that a single factor accounted for much of the common variance. This factor paralleled the major factor in Doyle & Moore's study. Fourteen items weighing heavily on this factor were selected as an Attitudes Toward Males in Society (AMS) scale. On this scale women were significantly more liberal than men. Older women were more liberal than younger women but there was no difference with age among men.

Attitudes toward males in society: A short emperically-based scale

The literature on sex role issues generally has been plagued by a tremendous variety of scales. Chun, Cobb & French (1975) identified over 100 different measures of various aspects of sex and sex role attitudes.

Gackenback (1978) proposes that these various measures can be conceptually divided into measures of masculinity/femininity (as a personality trait), sex stereotypy (attribution of masculinity/femininity to others) and sex role attitudes (attribution of attitudes on a broader range of sex role related phenomena). Gackenback's review of the literature suggests that these three sets of measures are not closely related to each other.

In the area of female sex-role issues a limited number of instruments appear to be gaining recognition and acceptance. This is not the case with measures of male sex-role issues. Several recognized measures exist of masculinity as a personality trait, for example the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1975). Little work has been done on male sex role stereotypy or attitudes. Many of the available measures (cf. Rombough & Ventimiglia, 1981) are conceptually flawed or are difficult to administer.

One of the more promising efforts is that of Doyle & Moore (1978). They factored five scales out of a large pool of items administered to several different groups. Their work provides an emperical basis for studying attitudes toward male

sex roles which neede to be replicated and extended. In particular our own reading of the semi-popular "male liberation" literature suggested a variety of content areas not represented in their pool of items. The present study was undertaken to clarify and broaden Doyle & Moore's work and to develop a measure of attitudes toward male roles in society.

Method

Subjects

Participants were volunteers in various undergraduate classes at Eastern Kentucky University. Useable responses were obtained from 61 males and 123 females.

Procedure:

Doyle & Moore's 45-item scale was reviewed and items reflecting additional content were generated. Items came from a variety of sources including reading of the popular and research literature, personal experiences, and discussion with other males. A total of nine males were ultimately involved and included students, professors, and practicing mental health professionals from a variety of disciplines. They included single, married, and divorced males from approximately 20 to 55 years old. A total of 40 additional items were generated after editing and eliminating obvious redundancies. These were added to Doyle & Moore's items to produce an 85-item pool. (Copies are available from the senior author on request)

Participants responded to the items on a scale from one, "agree strongly" to four, "disagree strongly". The instructions and answer scale are shown in Table 2. Responses were recorded on machine-readable answer sheets which were mechanically processed, hand-checked, and analyzed using the SAS (1979) statistical library package.

Results and Discussion

Following the procedure of Doyle & Moore (1978), results were analyzed using the alpha analysis procedure. (cf. Kaiser and Caffrey, 1965). This factor analytic procedure follows a classical-factor model in seeking a set of factors which are maximally correlated with the observed data. It is especially suited to the present situation because it assumes that the data are a sample from a universe of data or items rather than assuming that the data represent a universe of measures applied to a sample of individuals. Thus the procedure makes inferences about a population of possible items. Factors identified by the procedure were interpreted by identifying the items which loaded over .30 on each factor.

Forty-five item analysis

Results were initially analyzed using only the first 45 items which were the items used by Doyle & Moore.

The Alpha analysis produced eleven factors of which two were considered uninterpretable. The remaining nine factors included

four that closely duplicated Doyle & Moore's Factors 1,3,4, and 5. Table 1 shows this correspondence in terms of the number of items loading over .30 on both our factor and Doyle & Moore's corresponding factor and the number of items loading over .30 in only one of the two studies. The remaining five factors each consisted of two to eight items at least half of which were

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

part of Doyle & Moore's Factor 2.

Thus, in a direct replication, our analysis confirmed four of Doyle & Moore's five factors.

A striking feature of both our and Doyle & Moore's analysis is the large proportion of variance accounted for by Factor 1. (See Table 1). This is most striking in Doyle & Moore's study. In our own analysis, with a smaller N, less of the total variance is accounted for but Factor 1 still accounts for twice the variance of any other single factor. It should be noted that the alpha analysis procedure used does not force this result. Alpha analysis used classical factor analysis procedures which seek to identify a set of factors - as opposed to principal component procedures which begin by selecting a single best factor to account for the variance and then select succeeding factors to account for, in order, the remaining variance.

Eighty-five item analysis

The data were then analyzed using all 85 items. This time the same alpha analysis procedure generated a total of 23 factors

reflecting the wider range of content in the expanded instrument.

Examination of these factors revealed, again, a close correspondence with Doyle & Moore's results. The most important factor (Factor 2) accounted for 19.4% of the variance. No other factor accounted for over 4.5% of the variance. This factor consisted of 28 of the first 45 items including all 12 items on Doyle & Moore's Factor 4, 19 of the 21 items on Doyle & Moore's Factor 1, and 4 other items. It also included 15 of the 40 items added for this study.

Other factors included factors closely corresponding to Doyle & Moore's Factors 3 and 5 and nine other factors that appeared interpretable. Many of these contained portions of Doyle & Moore's Factor 2. The remaining 11 factors consisted of only one item or consisted of two to four items that had no discernible common content.

It should be obvious that the number of factors generated by a factor analysis reflects the range of content in the items which are analyzed. By included widely disparate items such that responses to them are not correlated it would, at least theoretically, be possible for a factor analysis to yield a separate factor for each item.

Thus the important result of our analysis is not that it yielded 23 possible factors but that, even after efforts to increase the range of content, a single factor continued to account for so much of the variance. Half of the items, including 15 of the 40 new items, continued to load appreciably on this factor. Thirty-four items, including 10 of the new items, loaded higher on this factor than on any other.

This result suggests that there is a single dimension

which accounts for much of people's understanding of the social role of males in our society.

Attitudes to Males in Society (AMS) scale

Fourteen items were selected to represent a "pure" scale of attitudes to males in contemporary society (AMS). These items loaded over .30 on Factor 1 and did not load higher on any other factor in either Doyle & Moore's study or in our analyses. These items are listed in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

AMS scores were computed for each participant and were compared to demographic data to gain an initial indication of variables influencing the scores.

Since the scale consists of 14 items each rated from 1 to 4, scores on the scale can range from 14 to 56 with higher scores reflecting a more "liberated" attitude toward male roles.

AMS scores for males and females are compared in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

A preliminary F' test for equality of variances showed that males had significantly higher variance so the means for the two sexes were compared using the T-Test assuming unequal variances. The results showed that females had a significantly more liberated view of male roles in society than males. Since males and females differed in their mean scores, sex was kept as a variable

in all further comparisons.

Effects of age on AMS scores are also shown in Table 3. The scores of males on the AMS did not change appreciably with age but older females were significantly more liberal than younger females ($r = .21$).

The effects of college major and Appalachian-nonAppalachian origin were also studied using 2-way ANOVAs (Sex x Major and Sex x Origin). The latter comparison was selected as a measure of traditional vs. non-traditional cultural backgrounds since approximately two thirds of each sex had reported an Appalachian background. These analyses yielded no significant main or interaction effects except for sex. Origin did approach significance ($F = 5.33$, $P = .0221$)

These results provide an interesting comparison to earlier studies of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence, Helmrick & Stapp, 1973) done here using a similar sample (Falkenberg, 1980, Hindman & Hindman, 1980). These studies found that females were also significantly more liberal than males in their attitudes toward female sex roles. Employed females were more liberal than student females but employed males were not different from student males. In light of current data the employment differences may better be understood in terms of age differences as the employed groups were approximately seven years older than the student groups. College major and Appalachian origin had no significant effect.

Thus comparison of AMS and AWS scores indicates that females are more liberal than males in their attitudes toward both male and female social roles. Furthermore, mature or experienced females (but not males) are more liberal in attitude toward both roles.

Clearly further study is needed both of the influence of social variables on AMS scores and of the AMS itself. Meanwhile, the present data do call into question the common anti-feminist or male chauvinist explanations of male attitudes toward female roles. If males are also more staunchly conservative in their views of themselves, then something more is involved. In view of the health risks associated with traditional male roles, further study is needed.

References

Bem, S.L. Beyond androgyny: Some presumptious prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In A.G.Kaplan and J.P. Boone (Eds.). Beyond sex role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown, 1975.

Chun, K., Cobb, S., & French, J.P.R. Measures for psychological assessment. Ann Arbor, MI.: Institute for Social Research, 1975.

Doyle, J.A. & Moore, R.J. Attitudes toward the male's role scale (AMR): An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the male's sex role in contemporary society. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1978, 8, 35.

Falkenberg, V.F. Sex role issues in unique circumstances. Paper presented at the meeting of the Kentucky Psychological Association, Lexington, April, 1980

Gackenback, J.I. A perceptual defense approach to the study of gender sex related traits, stereotypes, and attitudes. Journal of Personality, 1978, 46, 645-676.

Hindman, C.D., & Hindman, N.S. Sex role issues in rural mental health: The example of Appalachia. Paper presented at the meeting of the Kentucky Psychological Association, Lexington, April, 1980.

Kaiser, H.F., & Caffrey, J. Alpha Factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1965, 30, 1-14.

Rombough, S., & Ventimiglia, J.C. Sexism: A tri-dimensional phenomenon. Sex Roles, 1981, 7, 747-755.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale, Psychonomic Bulletin, 1973, 2, 219-220.

SAS Institute, Statistical Analysis System: User's Guide, 1979 Edition, Raleigh, NC: SAS Institute, 1979.

Table 1

Comparison of selected factors identified by Doyle & Moore (1978) and present study (first 45 items only)

Factor number				
present	1	3	4	7
D & M	1	4	3	5
Number of items				
in common	20	9	2	2
present only	4	2	0	0
D & M only	1	3	4	0
Precent variance				
present	11.8	5.9	2.2	2.7
D & M	27.3	3.1	4.1	2.7

Table 2

The Attitudes toward Males in Society (AMS) Scale

The statements below describe attitudes toward the role of men in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are to express your feelings about each statement be indicating whether you:

1 - agree strongly
2 - agree mildly
3 - disagree mildly
4 - disagree strongly

Men are naturally better drivers than women

Men are naturally better able to control their feelings than women

Men are naturally more mechanical than women

Men generally are more knowledgable about current events and therefore have "more important things to say" at social gatherings than women

Because men are strong and women are weak, it is only right that this is a man's world

Men can handle pressure situations better than women

It's common sense that men are naturally more worldly wise than women

Men are more likely than women to be skilled in occupations that call for competitive and logical abilities

It's a fact that most men are more interesting to listen to than most women

Men are naturally more skillful in athletics than women

On the average men should be considered as more capable of contributing to the country's economic stability than women

Men are inclined by nature to be more truthful and direct than women

It's only natural that men are more interested in sports than women

Men are more decisive in crisis situations than women

Table 3

Comparison of AMS scores for males and females

	Males	Females
N	61	123
Mean	36.20	46.67
SD	9.516	6.833
Range	17-56	20-56
F' (Var. Eq.)	1.94 (P = .002)	
T-Test	7.6684 (P < .0001)	
Age		
Mean	20.13	19.78
SD	2.31	2.03
Range	17-26	18-32
Correlation with AMS Score		
r	-.09	+.21
P (H_0)	.4469	.0149